



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

40

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/176,171 10/21/98 CHENG

D PHA23.503

EXAMINER

LM02/0203

CORPORATE PATENT COUNSEL
U S PHILIPS CORPORATION
580 WHITE PLAINS ROAD
TARRYTOWN NY 10591

PHAM, T	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER

2736
DATE MAILED:

7
02/03/00

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.
09/176,171

Applicant(s)
Cheng

Examiner
TOAN PHAM

Group Art Unit
2736



☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Dec 3, 1999

☒ This action is **FINAL**.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claims

☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been
☐ received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____.

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

☐ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

--- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ---

Art Unit: 2736

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

2. Claims 1, 2, 6, 9 and 13-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Rietkerk (5,748,083).

Regarding claims 1, 6 and 9: Rietkerk discloses a system for protection of goods against theft comprising an electronic appliance (107) having an appliance component for effecting a primary function of the appliance that is independent of security (see Fig. 2); and a status reporter (117) for actively and conditionally communicating a status of the appliance (107); an alarm activation processor (112, 113), operably coupled to the status reporter (117), for receiving the status and effecting an alarm response dependent on the status and dependent upon a rule base associated with the appliance (col. 4, lines 23-29; col. 5, lines 42-53, 64-67; col. 6, lines 1-2; Figs. 1A, 1B and 2). Thus, the rule base is to identify whether the event is an alarm detection condition (e.g. motion or circuit disruption) or a tamper condition (e.g. APD removal/intrusion, or cord

Art Unit: 2736

damage) and to notify security personal to the location of the alarm and/or tamper condition (col. 5, lines 42-53, 64-67; col. 6, lines 1-2).

Regarding claim 2: Rietkerk discloses the second appliance (107) with a second appliance component for effecting a second primary function independent of security; and the alarm activation processor is integrated in the second appliance (see Figs. 1A, 1B and 2).

Regarding claim 13: Rietkerk discloses an interactive appliance security system comprising the steps of storing a rule base associated with the first appliance (107) at a second appliance (107), communicating a status of the first appliance to the second appliance, determining an alarm response at the second appliance based on the rule base and the status of the first appliance, wherein the first appliance has a first appliance function that is independent of security and the second appliance has a second appliance function that is independent of security (col. 5, lines 25-53; Figs. 1A, 1B and 2).

Regarding claim 14: Rietkerk discloses the appliance being an asset (107) to be protected includes a desktop computer, a notebook computer, a laptop computer, a printer, a keyboard, a computer monitor, etc. (col. 4, lines 44-54; Fig. 2); thus, Rietkerk discloses a plurality of appliances having alarm activation processor (141), operably coupled to the status reporter (117), for receiving the status and effecting the alarm response dependent on the status and dependent upon the rule base associated with the appliance (col. 4, lines 23-29; col. 5, lines 42-53, 64-67; col. 6, lines 1-2; Figs. 1A, 1B, 2, 3 and 4). Thus, the rule base is to identify whether the event is an alarm detection condition (e.g. motion or circuit disruption) or a tamper condition (e.g. APD

Art Unit: 2736

removal/intrusion, or cord damage) and to notify security personal to the location of the alarm and/or tamper condition (col. 5, lines 42-53, 64-67; col. 6, lines 1-2).

Regarding claim 15: Reitkerk discloses the alarm response is dependent upon a status of the appliance (col. 5, lines 16-24, 42-53, 64-67; col. 6, lines 1-2).

Regarding claim 16: Reitkerk discloses the rule base with respect to motion, circuit disruption, tamper conditions, intrusion etc. all corresponds with each other (col. 5, lines 47-53).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 3, 4, 7, 8, 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rietkerk (5,748,083) in view of Hall et al. (5,898,831) (of record).

Regarding claims 3 and 4: Rietkerk does not disclose a respective HAVi and Home API-compliant module; however, Hall et al. discloses an interactive appliance security system including security devices such as a personal digital assistant, television, radio, copier, computer, etc. (col. 5, lines 55-65) which are home and office systems that are programmed and interfaced to work with one another to provide a security monitoring system (col. 14, lines 29-54; col. 15, lines 23-44). Thus, these devices are programmed to work in compliance with one another. Therefore, it

Art Unit: 2736

would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a security system for the home or office in protecting the appliances with programming capability as taught by Hall et al. in a system as disclosed by Rietkerk for providing a programmable compliance module that interacts and works with one another to provide an addressable network and corresponding security system.

Regarding claims 7, 8, 10 and 11: See claims 3 and 4 above.

5. Claims 3, 4, 7, 8, 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rietkerk (5,748,083) in view of Le Van Suu (5,714,933) (of record).

Regarding claims 5 and 12: Rietkerk does not disclose an area security device. Le Van Suu discloses an area security device (13) for detecting an area status of area wherein the activation processor is also operably coupled to the area security device (13) and further effects each alarm response dependent on the area status (col. 4, lines 8-22). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide an area security device as taught by Le Van Suu in a system as disclosed by Rietkerk to provide a detector for monitoring the surrounding area of the electronic appliances and for the purpose of providing additional security by monitoring intrusion into the area of the protected appliances.

Art Unit: 2736

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed on December 03, 1999 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Because,

Applicant's Arguments:

A) Reitkerk neither teaches nor implies a rule base that is associated with the appliance being protected.

B) Neither Rietkerk, Hall, nor Le Van Suu teaches nor suggests a HAVi or Home-API compliant modules for status reporting and alarm activation.

Response to Arguments:

A) Reitkerk discloses the rule base associated with the appliance (col. 4, lines 23-29; col. 5, lines 42-53, 64-67; col. 6, lines 1-2; Figs. 1A, 1B, 2 and 3). Thus, the rule base is to identify whether the event is an alarm detection condition (e.g. motion or circuit disruption) or a tamper condition (e.g. APD removal/intrusion, or cord damage) and to notify security personal to the location of the alarm and/or tamper condition (col. 5, lines 42-53, 64-67; col. 6, lines 1-2).

B) Rietkerk and Le Van Suu does not disclose a respective HAVi and Home API-compliant module; however, Hall et al. discloses an interactive appliance security system including security devices such as a personal digital assistant, television, radio, copier, computer, etc. (col. 5, lines 55-65) which are home and office systems that are programmed and interfaced to work with one another to provide a security monitoring system (col. 14, lines 29-54; col. 15, lines 23-44). Thus, a respective HAVi and Home API is merely a software program that is programmed

Art Unit: 2736

into the respective appliances to work in compliance with one another; therefore the teaching of Hall et al. are indicative of the respective HAVi and Home API module.

Conclusion

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

8. Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

Art Unit: 2736

(703) 308-9051 or (703) 305-3988, (for formal communications intended for entry)

Or:

(703) 305-3988 (for informal or draft communications, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington. VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).


9. Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Examiner Toan Pham at telephone number (703) 306-3038. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 7:00am-5:00pm.

If attempt to reach the examiner by telephone is unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeffery Hofsass, can be reached on (703) 305-4717.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-8576, Mon-Fri, 8:30am-5:00pm.

Examiner: Toan Pham

Date: February 1, 2000


DANIEL J. WU
Primary Examiner
02/03/00